UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/627,880	07/28/2003	Menahem Kroll	25602	3641

20529	7590	08/22/2006

NATH & ASSOCIATES
112 South West Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER
BROWN JR, NATHAN H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2121	

DATE MAILED: 08/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/627,880	KROLL, MENAHEM
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nathan H. Brown, Jr.	2121	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _(3)_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _03 May 2006_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-25_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _6/2/06_.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

Examiner's Detailed Office Action

1. This Office is responsive to the communication for application 10/627,880, filed May 3, 2006.

2. Claims 1-25 have been examined and it is noted that: claims 1, 3-5, 13, 15-17, 24, and 25 have been amended; claims 2, 6-12, 14, and 18-23 remain in their original form.

3. After the first office action, claims 1-25 stand rejected. New grounds have been determined for the rejection of claims 1, 13, 24, and 25

4. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims are considered to be an algorithm that does not meet the standard set forth in the State Street Bank case of being tangible, useful, and concrete. In this instance the claims are not considered to be tangible since no real world result is provided. Establishing that an event is true or false, in the abstract, is not a real world result that has practical application.

5. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-13, 15-18, and 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Curtis et al.* (USPN 6208720 B1).

Regarding claims 1, 24, and 25. *Curtis et al.* teach a method, program storage device, and

computer program product (*see* Abstract, *Examiner interprets database to be a computer storage*

device.) for determining whether a situation (*see* col. 5, lines 28-30, *Examiner interprets*

"Domain-specific implementation" to comprise a situation description. See col. 8, III.

Processing Event Records, lines 3-14, Examiner interprets "When implemented as a

telecommunications fraud detection system..." to mean that the domain-specific implementation

is to determine fraud situations.) is logically true or false upon occurrence of an event (*see* col.

2, §SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION, lines 23-24, *Examiner interprets an alarm to indicate*

that a fraud situation is logically 'true' (i.e., inferred by the rule base).), said method

comprising: using conditions associated with said situation in combination with current values of

parameters related to said conditions (*see* col. 5, lines 22-27, *Examiner interprets "presentation*

parameters and external system interacting parameters" to be parameters related to said

conditions.) to create a database of current thresholds each corresponding to respective limits

which characterize the situation (*see* col. 15, lines 29-33) and at least one of which is a

composite threshold that encapsulates multiple conditions that can be directly compared with a

single respective value of a parameter associated with an event (*see* col. 16, lines 13-18);

responsive to an event, comparing successive parameters associated with the event with

respective ones of the current thresholds until either there are no more thresholds to be compared

or until it can be definitively established that the situation is logically true or false (*see* col. 18,

lines 30-35); and prior to processing a subsequent event, updating the current thresholds in said

database (*see* col. 19, lines 27-37).

Regarding claim 12. *Curtis et al.* teach the method according to claim 1, wherein the boundaries

of the time histories (see col. 8, lines 40-41, *Examiner interprets "network event records" as*

time histories.) vary from client to client randomly or arbitrarily (see col. 20, lines 47-50,

Examiner interprets "X number of completed international calls using the same authcode/BTN

overlap in time by at least N minutes within a sliding window of time T" to be call time histories

wherein the boundaries vary from client to client (using the same authcode/BTN fraudulently)

randomly or arbitrarily within N minutes in a sliding window of time.).

Regarding claim 13. *Curtis et al.* teach a system (*see* Abstract) for determining whether a

situation (*see* above) is logically true or false upon occurrence of an event (*see* above), said

system comprising: a database of current thresholds each corresponding to respective limits

which characterize the situation (*see* above) and at least one of which is a composite threshold

that encapsulates multiple conditions that can be directly compared with a single respective value

of a parameter associated with an event (*see* above); a synchronous processor responsive to an

event for comparing successive parameters associated with the event with respective ones of the

current thresholds until either there are no more thresholds to be compared or until it can be

definitively established that the situation is logically true or false (*see* Fig. 3 and col. 12, lines 18-

38, *Examiner interprets 310a...310n to be the synchronous processors supporting synchronous*

automatic system operations.); and an asynchronous processor responsive to the event for

updating the current thresholds in said database prior to processing a subsequent event (*see* Fig. 3

and col. 12, lines 1-38, *Examiner interprets 152a...152n to be the asynchronous processors*

supporting asynchronous manual operations.).

Regarding claims 3 and 15. *Curtis et al.* teach the method according to claim 1 and system

according to claim 13, wherein the successive thresholds are compared according to a

predetermined hierarchy so parameters are processed in progressively decreasing orders of

importance (*see*, col. 19, lines 56-59, "There is no hierarchy required for applying the most

specific threshold. Users could, however, implement a hierarchy if desired. One event may

generate more than one OTCD alarm.").

Regarding claims 4 and 5. *Curtis et al.* teach the method according to claim 1, wherein the event

is associated with a transaction that must be authorized prior to completion and the method

includes comparing at least one parameter with a corresponding boundary threshold and rejecting

the transaction if the at least one parameter does not pass the corresponding boundary threshold

or authorizing the transaction if the at least one, parameter passes the corresponding boundary

threshold (*see* col. 11 line 50 to col. 12 line 17, *Examiner asserts that the live operators can*

reject or authorize transactions manually for cases on the boundary of the fraud definition

supplied in the implementation.).

Regarding claims 6 and 18. *Curtis et al.* teach the method according to claim 4 and the system

according to claim 16, wherein the at least one parameter relates to a location from which a

transaction is performed and the corresponding boundary threshold is a composite threshold that

relates to a geographical boundary within which the transaction may be authorized (*see* col. 21,

lines 5-19, *Examiner interprets the boundary threshold to be the composite of* "...*combinations*

of originations and terminations or... a latitude/longitude for each country or NPA and a

maximum travel speed...".).

Regarding claims 8 and 20. *Curtis et al.* teach the method according to claim 4 and system

according to claim 16, wherein the at least one parameter relates to a monetary value and the

corresponding boundary threshold relates to a monetary value that may be authorized (*see* col.

25, lines 15-22).

Regarding claim 9. *Curtis et al.* teach the method according to claim 1, further including

updating the current thresholds based on external information (*see* col. 12, lines 5-11, *Examiner*

interprets credit card issuer or owner indications to be external information and the data the live

operator enters into the system to generate alarms immediately to be threshold data.).

Regarding claims 10 and 22. *Curtis et al.* teach the method according to claim 7 and the system

according to claim 19, wherein at least one of said thresholds relates to a geographical location

from which a subsequent event may be validly initiated (*see* col. 23, lines 5-11, *Examiner*

interprets a geographical profile to consist of at least one threshold that relates to a

geographical location and a geographical profile representing a 'normal pattern' to consist of

at least one threshold that relates to a geographical location from which a subsequent event may

be validly initiated.).

Regarding claim 11. *Curtis et al.* teach the method according to claim 7, including generating

one or more time-histories each relating to events originating at a specific time range prior to

subsequent event and using said time-histories to update the threshold for the subsequent event

(*see* Fig. 4, Steps 434 and 436, *Examiner interprets a call history database to consist of one or*

more time-histories each relating to events (telephone calls) originating at a specific time range

prior to subsequent event (e.g., a later telephone call from the same number).).

Regarding claims 16 and 17. *Curtis et al.* teach the system according to claim 13, wherein the

event is associated with a transaction that must be authorized prior to completion and the

synchronous processor is adapted to compare at least one parameter with a corresponding

boundary threshold and to reject the transaction if the at least one parameter does not pass the

corresponding boundary threshold or to authorize the transaction if the at least one parameter

passes the corresponding boundary threshold (*see* col. 11 line 50 to col. 12 line 17, *Examiner*

asserts that the live operators can reject or authorize transactions manually for cases on the

boundary of the fraud definition supplied in the implementation and then update the server

database on one of the synchronous processors to compare at least one parameter with a

corresponding boundary threshold for normal or fraudulent patterns.).

Regarding claim 23. *Curtis et al.* teach the system according to claim 19, wherein the

asynchronous processor is adapted to generate one or more time-histories each relating to events

originating from a common time origin and using said time-histories to update the thresholds

(*see* col. 11, lines 60-67 and col. 12, lines 1-3, *Examiner interprets "two simultaneous credit*

card calls and ... ten calls within one hour" to be one or more time-histories. Examiner further

asserts that for the live operator to "...input data into the system so that...threshold rules or

profiles are altered..." the asynchronous processor of their workstation must be used.).

Regarding claim 21. *Curtis et al.* teach the system according to claim 13, wherein the

asynchronous processor is adapted to update the current thresholds based on external information

(*see* col. 12, lines 5-11, *Examiner interprets credit card issuer or owner indications to be*

external information and the data the live operator enters into the system to generate alarms

immediately to be threshold data. Examiner further asserts that the data the live operator enters

into the system is first entered via an asynchronous processor associated with their

workstation.).

6. Claims 2 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Curtis et al.*

in view of *Monson-Haefel*, "Enterprise JavaBeans", 2000.

Regarding claims 2 and 14. *Curtis et al.* teach the method according to claim 1 and the system

according to claim 13. *Curtis et al.* do not teach the method or system, further including

blocking response to, or rejecting, subsequent events pending completion of updating the current

thresholds in the database. *Monson-Haefel* does teach blocking response to, or rejecting,

subsequent events pending completion of updating the current thresholds in the database (*see*

§8.3. Isolation and Database Locking, para. 8.3.2. Database Locks, "An exclusive write lock

prevents other transactions from reading or changing data until the current transaction is

complete. An exclusive write lock prevents dirty reads by other transactions.", *Examiner*

interprets an exclusive write lock to be a block.). It would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to persons having ordinary skill in the art to combine *Curtis et al.* with

Monson-Haefel to prevent dirty reads by other transactions.

7. Claims 7 and 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Curtis et al.* in

view of *Yoshioka et al.* (USPN 6425039 B2).

Regarding claims 7 and 19. *Curtis et al.* teach the method according to claim 1 and the system

according to claim 13. *Curtis et al.* do not teach the asynchronous processor adapted to compute

at least one of said thresholds in response to a trigger generated by a real-time clock in response

to said event, the real time clock being set or otherwise modified in response to said events.

Yoshioka et al. do teach the asynchronous processor (*see* col. 2, lines 43-47 and Fig. 1, *Examiner*

interprets the "data processor" (subsequently referred to as "the single-chip data processor") to

be an asynchronous processor.) adapted to compute at least one of said thresholds in response to

a trigger generated by a real-time clock (*see* col. 7, lines 50-55, *Examiner asserts the real-time*

clock "continues the timekeeping operation even when the supply of operation clocks to the

central processing unit CPU is interrupted" and thus generates all triggers in the state where

the CPU's clocks are interrupted.) in response to said event (see col. 3, lines 54-57, *Examiner*

interprets "exception event" to be said event and "internal conditions of a status

register" to be said thresholds.), the real time clock being set or otherwise modified in response

to said events (*see* col. 7, lines 64-66, *Examiner interprets "executes the start of bus cycles for*

the above-mentioned peripheral modules" to mean setting the RTC.). It would have been

obvious at the time the invention was made to persons having ordinary skill in the art to combine

Curtis et al. with *Yoshioka et al.* to shorten the time required for the transition from a moment of

occurrence of an exception event during normal processing to the operation of an exception

handler for coping with the exception event.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of
> making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to
> which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth
> the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

9. Amended claims 1, 13, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing

to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which

was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the

relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the

claimed invention. Amended claims 1, 13, 24, and 25 recite:

> using conditions associated with said situation in combination with current values of
> parameters related to said conditions to create a database of current thresholds each
> corresponding to respective limits which characterize the situation and at least one of
> which is a composite threshold that encapsulates multiple conditions that can be directly
> compared with a single respective value of a parameter associated with an event and thus
> obviates the need to compare each of said multiple conditions with the respective value;

Examiner's interprets this passage leads to assert a "composite threshold" which "encapsulates

multiple conditions that can be directly compared with a single respective value of a parameter"

that "obviates the need to compare each of said multiple conditions with the respective value".

Consider the definition of 'obviate' from the Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary

(http://www.m-w.com/dictionary/obviate):

> Main Entry: ob·vi·ate
> : to anticipate and prevent (as a situation) or make unnecessary (as an action)

The definition of obviate implies that the "composite threshold" makes comparing each of the

multiple conditions with the respective value unnecessary for establishing the truth or falsity of a

situation.

When we look to the Specification for a definition of "composite threshold" we do not find an

explicit definition but a definition by example of the use of the thing being defined. On page 5

of the Specification it is asserted that:

> the invention allows determination as to whether a situation is logically true or false by
> minimizing the amount of processing that needs to be performed upon occurrence of an
> event in order to establish whether the situation is logically true of false. This is achieved
> by pre-processing the thresholds so as to compute at least one composite threshold that
> may be compared with the instantaneous value of a respective parameter at initiation of
> the event, and updating such thresholds immediately after each event is processed, in
> preparation for the next event;

The assertion that: "the invention allows determination as to whether a situation is logically true

or false by minimizing the amount of processing that needs to be performed upon occurrence of

an event in order to establish whether the situation is logically true of false" is circular reasoning.

First, "minimizing the amount of processing that needs to be performed" doesn't establish logical

truth or falsity, but reduces the number of computations required to establish logical truth or falsity to a minimum. Removing this part of the assertion leaves: "the invention allows determination as to whether a situation is logically true or false ... in order to establish whether the situation is logically true of false". This is clearly circular reasoning.

This assertion is then followed by: "This is achieved by pre-processing the thresholds so as to compute at least one composite threshold that may be compared with the instantaneous value of a respective parameter at initiation of the event, and updating such thresholds immediately after each event is processed, in preparation for the next event;." At this point the question becomes: what is the "This" that is achieved—the "determination as to whether a situation is logically true or false" or "minimizing the amount of processing that needs to be performed upon occurrence of an event"?

After a definition of synchronous and asynchronous we find, on page 6 of the Specification that:

> In effect such an approach establishes asynchronously a set of binary
> thresholds that allow synchronous true/false comparison of external "real world"
> parameters so as to quickly determine whether a situation has occurred or not.

Here, it seems that the composite threshold hasn't obviated the need to compare each of said multiple conditions with the respective value, only established the threshold values asynchronously.

Pages 6-7 of the Specification provide an example of using a composite threshold. By the second paragraph of p. 7 the Applicant states:

> It will thus be noted that in this very simple example, only a single comparison need ever be made, thus halving the number of comparisons required in equivalent conventional systems. Of course, in practice, events can be much more convoluted and require possible successive comparison of multiple thresholds, but since many of these conditions are composite conditions, and are updated asynchronously to provide respective current composite thresholds, a much smaller number of synchronous comparisons and tests need to be made since the cumulative or historical data associated with those thresholds need not be analyzed synchronously.

This passage makes it clear that the composite threshold hasn't obviated the need to compare

each of said multiple conditions with the respective value since "in practice ... a much smaller

number of synchronous comparisons ... need to be made since the cumulative or historical data

associated with those thresholds need not be analyzed synchronously".

Finally, on p. 7 of the Specification the Applicant states:

> One principal distinction over hitherto-proposed systems is as follows. In
> known systems, multiple conditions that require an event parameter to lie within
> corresponding thresholds in order to establish whether an event has occurred must
> each be computed separately. Moreover, cumulative or historical data associated
> with thresholds must be analyzed before it can be determined whether a situation is
> true or false and this is time-consuming and not amenable to synchronous processing. On
> the other hand, in the invention, multiple conditions are pre-processed, prior to every
> event, in order to establish a single composite threshold that requires much fewer
> comparisons in real-time upon occurrence of an event. After each event, recent data and
> historical data are processed asynchronously in the background, but immediately, (in
> other words - on-line, but not synchronously) and prior to the next event as opposed to,
> say, daily, or every few hours, to update the specific thresholds applicable for the specific
> client at the specific time and it is only these thresholds that need ever be processed on-
> line.

Examiner notes, that although the comparisons may not have to be made synchronously, they have to be made at some time, or the other, to establish the truth or falsity of the situation since the truth or falsity of the situation is dependent upon all of the threshold relations being either true or false. Thus, the number of comparisons is not reduced, just delayed or given a lower processing priority. Clearly, the Specification does not show that the composite threshold obviates the need to compare each of said multiple conditions.

The claims, thus, contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

10. Claims 1, 13, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Since claims 1, 13, 24, and 25 contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s) had possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed (*see* above), the claims certainly do not describe the invention in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. If we are concerned with making the claimed invention and we understand that the

"composite threshold...obviates the need to compare each of said multiple conditions with the respective value" as claimed and as a consequence we allocate no computational resources for comparing each of said multiple conditions with the respective value, then our implementation would either fail or be impaired in performance for the determination of the truth or falsity of a situation if, as the specification asserts, the comparisons are just delayed or placed in background processing. If we are concerned with using the claimed invention and we understand that the "composite threshold...obviates the need to compare each of said multiple conditions with the respective value" as claimed and as a consequence we do not provide the data needed to compare each of said multiple conditions with the respective value, then our implementation would either fail or produce erroneous determinations of the truth or falsity of a situation if, as the specification asserts, the comparisons are just delayed or placed in the background for processing with, in this case, no data to process.

In either case, the claims and specification must be made to cohere to enable one skilled in the art to which they pertain, or with which they are most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection of claims 1-12 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The amendment to claim 1 "now adds the feature that the transaction is authorized or blocked in accordance with whether the situation is found to be logically true or false. This is clearly a real world result ..." The Examiner notes that this is just the opposite of a "real world result" produced by the transaction processing software. In a real-world result, the situation is found to be logically true or false in accordance with whether the transaction is authorized or blocked. A good example of a real world result, in this context, would be: the transaction I am transacting is unauthorized or blocked, causing the door to the ATM in which I am standing to be locked, thus preventing my leaving the premises of the ATM until it is determined (by software or otherwise) that my ATM activity is not fraudulent. Here, the software determines the truth or falsity of the atomic proposition: free_to_go(Examiner,after(transaction)). Examiner therefore maintains the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection of claims 1-12.

12. Applicant's arguments filed with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection of claims 1, 3-6, 8-13, 15-18, and 20-25 as being anticipated by *Curtis* have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. As shown above, Applicant's teaching that "a composite threshold ... obviates the need to compare each of said multiple conditions with the respective value" is not supported by the specification. Examiner thus concludes that: to the extent that a "composite threshold" can be practically implemented it would have to work in the same fashion and, most importantly,

achieve the same result as the situation processing in Curtis in the same context. Examiner

maintains the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection of claims 1, 3-6, 8-13, 15-18, and 20-25 as being

anticipated by *Curtis*.

13. Applicant's arguments filed with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 2 and 14

as being unpatentable over *Curtis* in view of *Monson* have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

With respect to the **blocked operations** argument, Examiner asserts that financial transactions

such as purchases and withdrawals generally require or are associated with database read, writes,

and updates; thus blocking the associated database read, writes, and updates blocks the financial

transaction. With respect to **determination of duration** argument, Examiner notes that claims 2

and 14, in claiming to "blocking response to, or rejecting, subsequent events pending completion

of updating the current thresholds in the database" do nothing different than in Monson and

traditional database locking, where a process holds a lock until it has performed subsequent

computations to insure the integrity of its processing of a transaction. Examiner therefore

maintains the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 2 and 14 as being unpatentable over *Curtis* in

view of *Monson*.

14. Applicant's arguments filed with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 7 and 19

as being unpatentable over *Curtis* in view of *Yoshioka* have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive. The Applicant argues that:

Yoshioka fails to cure the deficiencies of Curtis, as Yoshioka does not disclose, teach, or suggest a composite threshold "that encapsulates multiple conditions that can be directly compared with a single respective value of a parameter associated with an event and thus obviates the need to compare each of said multiple conditions with the respective value" as set forth in independent claims 1 and 13, from which claims 7 and 19 depend, respectively.

As shown above, Applicant's teaching that "a composite threshold ... obviates the need to compare each of said multiple conditions with the respective value" is not supported by the Specification. Examiner thus concludes that: to the extent that a "composite threshold" can be practically implemented it would have to work in the same fashion and, most importantly, achieve the same result as the situation processing in *Curtis* where *Yoshioka* satisfies the requirement for an asynchronous processor with real-time clock triggering of threshold computations. Examiner therefore maintains the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 7 and 19 as being unpatentable over *Curtis* in view of *Yoshioka*.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Correspondence Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Nathan H. Brown, Jr. whose telephone number is 571-272- 8632. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-F 0830-1700. If attempts to reach the examiner by

telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Knight can be reached on 571-

272-3687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 703-872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained

from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more

information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions

on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-

9197 (toll-free).

Anthony Knight
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Tech Center 2100

Nathan H. Brown, Jr.

RAMESH PATEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER